

[CONFIDENTIAL.]

[No. 20 of 1875.]

# REPORT ON NATIVE PAPERS

FOR

The Week ending the 15th May 1875.

THE *Madhyastha* of Chaitra 1281 B.S. writes the following in a paragraph on Mulharrao :—With his fall, the honors and liberty of the ancient royal dynasties of India, which have so long, though even nominally, been independent, have gone for ever. Henceforth Residents and Agents will be sole and absolute monarchs over those nominal princes. The people of India have been mortified from the fact, and justly too, that Lord Northbrook has deposed the Guicowar. If this had been premeditated by Government, why was the Commission appointed at all? Was it not then a mockery? Some of our contemporaries ask India to bewail her misfortunes. But do they not know that, from constant loud-wailing, her voice is gone, and she is too weak to cry out?

MADHYASTHA  
CHAITRA, 1281 B.S.

2. The *Rungpore Dik Prakash* of the 22nd April, in an article on the "Unfortunate Guicowar," makes the following observations, in reference to his deposition by Lord Northbrook, in spite of his acquittal by the majority of the Commissioners :—The present policy of the British Government is not, as it was during the administration of Lord Clive, Lord Hastings, or of Lord Dalhousie, characterized by selfishness and injustice; especially now when a statesman like Lord Northbrook, who may be regarded as an incarnation of mercy and justice, is at the head of the Indian administration. With him for our ruler, it had never occurred to us—nay, not even in our dreams—that such gross injustice would be done. We had thought that, on the acquittal of the Guicowar, he would be generously restored to his throne, and Lord Northbrook would thus have an opportunity of displaying his magnanimity. But the fates are adverse to Mulharrao. It is rumoured that Lord Northbrook was resolved to resign his office if he were not deposed. It simply excites our wonder—nay, it pains us—to hear of such a resolution made by a powerful Governor-General, regarding an obedient vassal of the British Government. It is not indeed a difficult matter to act so, towards those who subsist only on the favours of Government, and who are ruined by the least indication of its displeasure. The will of the ruler is sufficient. But everybody must admit that to spare such beings is extremely difficult, and such an act would shew the greatness of the man who can do it.

RUNGPORE DIK  
PRAKASH,  
April 22nd, 1875.

It behoves the Governor-General to consider for a moment, whether there be a single person, now in India, who actually possesses the power of a king. The few that are such, in name only, are intensely loyal to the British Government, and are completely at its mercy. They do not possess the least independence. Their real condition is truly miserable. But in spite of their misery, even their empty titles are still an honor to the country, and serve to remind us of the former existence of native kings. Does it then



now behove a liberal and just Government gradually to deprive them of their kingdoms by force and artifice, and thus take away the honors and dignities they have enjoyed for a long time past? What will history say of this? Shall it not speak to future generations of the intense selfishness of the English nation? Shall it not brand the English as a nation of oppressors and plunderers? Government should never defile the high purity of British policy by injustice. If Mulharrao had been guilty, this punishment would have been condign, and nobody would have said anything against it. But when he has been acquitted by the majority of the Commissioners, it is not at all fair thus to punish him. Such a course is alike repugnant to the interests of morality and politics. However excellent may be the administration of Lord Northbrook, and however great may be his love towards the subjects, his beneficence to the country and other noble virtues, the memory of this single affair at Baroda, the deposition of Mulharrao, this single fault will throw all his virtues into the shade, and will give rise to feelings of intense hatred. Hence, in conclusion, we request our Governor-General not to bring upon himself wide-spread unpopularity by inconsiderately deposing the Guicowar.

RUNGPORE DIX  
PRAKASH,  
April 29th, 1875.

3. The same paper of the 29th April, in an article on "Mulharrao," after deploring the miserable fate of that prince, proceeds to remark thus:— We respect and love the English for their impartiality and justice. For the same reason we are always happy to be under subjection to them; and unhesitatingly state our objections to what appears wrong in their actions. So that if the good of the country and the interests of the public demand that, for the sake of justice, we should comment on their action regarding Baroda, we shall do it. If it was, from the first, the intention of Lord Northbrook to depose Mulharrao, what was the need of appointing a grand commission to go through the formality of a mock trial? What was the need of wasting so much public money and heaping so much trouble, shame, and humiliation on the Guicowar? He could have been deposed as soon as the intimation of his fault had reached the Government. After having made vast preparations for his trial, it has not been at all becoming to betray the extreme haste, that has been shewn in the ultimate decision of so momentous a question.

SADHARANI,  
May 2nd, 1875.

4. The *Sádháraní* of the 2nd May, in its opening editorial, entitled the "Hooghly Municipality," remarks, with regret, on the apathy which the Bengalis manifest with regard to important public matters. The recent disgrace of Baboo Nemy Chand Shíl of Chinsurah, a municipal commissioner of Hooghly, at the hands of the District Magistrate, Mr. Pellew, and against which he found no satisfaction by appealing to the Lieutenant-Governor, far from leading, as it should have done, the whole body of native municipal commissioners throughout the country to agitate the matter, has been but quietly looked on and dismissed from their minds. Before the time of Sir George Campbell, District Magistrates did not possess the power of suspending Deputy Magistrates under them from their posts. Since his time, however, they are supposed to have been vested with that power. But the question now to be solved is whether Deputy Magistrates are on an equal footing with Municipal Commissioners? We say, no. The commissioner is a colleague of the Magistrate; and is not, moreover, like the Deputy Magistrate, a paid servant of the State. He serves the public of his own accord, and is appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor himself. The whole body of native municipal commissioners should therefore strenuously exert themselves to obtain a satisfactory solution of the question now raised.



5. The same paper has an article headed the "Ruin of the Zemindar class," communicated by one, who advocates their interests. The writer remarks:—Considerable good may be expected to accrue from the discussions, at the present time, respecting the rights of the landlords, and the vast body of the population who are known as the tenantry. It is a matter of regret, however, that these discussions are never carried on in a spirit of impartiality, nor with careful consideration of all the facts, which alone can enable one to ascertain the rights and privileges, the wants and grievances of the parties concerned. It is indeed true that the condition of the peasantry is miserable; and that every educated man in Bengal feels it his duty to exert himself on their behalf. It is not, moreover, a little to the credit of the English, that, under their Government and from a study of their writings, manners, and customs, the natives have learnt to sympathize with the poverty-stricken tenantry. But, what is to be regretted is, that, becoming sentimental from an excess of this sympathy, not a few are still unable to arrive at a right solution of the question; and consequently the means, they propose for improving the condition of the ryots, do not always prove advantageous. In the opinion of such men, the zemindars are an oppressive class; and the poverty of the ryots is owing entirely to their oppressions. They would therefore urge the utter extermination of the zemindar class; and they hold, that the condition of the ryots would be considerably improved, if there were no intermediate agency between them and Government. Though such a sentiment is not freely expressed, still there can be no doubt as to their being actuated by it in their writings against the zemindars. We have dwelt before on the question, as to whether the zemindars really harassed their tenantry. Still, if, for the sake of argument, we were to admit that they are a set of oppressors, would the extermination of this class of landholders improve the condition of the ryots? Government may, if it chooses, abolish the system of zemindaries, *putnees*, *durputnees*, and *seputnees*, but would the abolition conduce to the good of the tenants? We believe it would not. The use of the terms alone will perhaps be discontinued, but the relations between the zemindars and their tenants will continue to exist; for Government, not being a single individual, will not be able to attend to all their matters personally; moreover, it is even beyond the power of a single person to rule unaided, and in every way the whole of Bengal. Hence it will be necessary to increase the number of officers now engaged in the administration of the country; and they will take the place of the present zemindars, putneedars, &c. We do not see what there will be to prevent these new officers from turning oppressors of the tenants, as completely as the zemindars are believed to be. On the contrary, it is highly probable that they will thus act; for in their case there will be a want of that vital interest in the improvement of the soil which the zemindars possess; and, being new masters, they will have very little to attach them to the tenantry, who, in the case of zemindars, have been bound by ties of affection which have descended from father to son. They will hardly study the interests of the ryots during their short tenure of office, while there is every probability of their seeking to please Government at their expense. It is therefore perfectly clear that the extinction of the zemindar class will neither benefit the tenantry nor the Government. Such an event will only deprive the zemindars of the small profits which they acquire after paying the Government revenue, while the tenants will have to pay the same rent as before. The only difference will be that a number of officers will be allowed to enjoy the profits, which now fall to the share of the zemindar. In conclusion, it is remarked that the extinction of zemindaries or of the system

SADHARANI,  
May 2nd, 1875.



under which they exist, will not in the least be productive of beneficial consequences; though it is desirable that the latter should be reformed.

SADHARANI,  
May 2nd, 1875.

6. The same paper, in an article on the Guicowar, says—Now that the papers regarding the trial of Mulharrao have been published, we shall content ourselves with making two remarks on the subject:—(1) The difference between the European and Native Commissioners is noteworthy. The three former are unanimous in their opinion as to the guilt of the accused. They signed a joint report on the same day. The Native Commissioners have each made a separate report, and on different dates, and all agree as to their opinions. It is curious to note that, not a single Native Commissioner would agree with one of his European colleagues, and *vice versa*. (2) One of the questions raised by the Indian Government in connection with the trial of Mulharrao is, whether the accused has been able to meet the evidence adduced against him? Now, formerly it used to be held that an accused person should be regarded innocent, until he is proved guilty. But from what we have seen of this trial, we are led to infer that that theory is now exploded, and that whoever is brought before a court must be regarded as guilty, until he can establish his own innocence. This theory is not only fearful, but involves a grave error.

SADHARANI,  
May 9th, 1875.

7. The following is from the *Sádháraní* of the 9th May. In a lengthy editorial on the Agrarian Disturbances, the editor, after observing that changes and revolutions in society are to be preferred to a state of stagnation, inasmuch as they are indications of life and activity, and that the rights and interests of sixty millions of ryots are of greater importance to society than those of only six men who occupy the position of landlords, proceeds to remark that, as in the physical world, so in the constitution and progress of society, change is the law of existence and vitality. No power can put a stop to these ceaseless changes going on in the world. No one has any power to check the dissensions that must continue to rage between landlords and their tenantry. But in its fondness for making laws, the English Government seems to think that legislation is a panacea for all evils. They have unbounded faith in the power of their own laws. By decapitating the Berhampore and Kishnaghur colleges, they thought they had destroyed the giant of high education. By making laws for the marriage of widows, they hope to remove the *Ekádashí*\* from the calendar. They hope to facilitate the administration of justice by enacting laws of evidence. By passing Act XLV (the Penal Code?) they fancy they have banished the wicked from the country: and think to accomplish the perfect administration of the kingdom, by publishing resolutions in the Gazette, on Commissioners' reports, compiled from the statements of officers, which again are prepared from those furnished by the police or the peon.

Sir Richard Temple seems to have contemplated an entire cessation of dissensions between landlords and tenants by passing a law of sixteen sections in Bengal. It is not indeed strange that everybody should think his own weapon invincible—nay, some good also accrues from such conceit. We also willingly fall into such an error, and fancy that newspapers alone will do everything that the country needs. So that it is not at all strange that Sir Richard, so famous for writing minutes, should come forward to establish, by a minute, good feelings between landlords and tenants; nor do we blame him for that. We condemn his haste and impatience.

It is now sought, through the agency of Deputy Collectors and by passing a short law within a month's time, to put a stop to the disputes in a

\* The eleventh day of every bright and dark fortnight of the moon, observed as fast by Hindu widows.



( 5 )

pergunnah, about the enhancement of rent, which have continued to exist since 1793. Owing to the dilatoriness that marks the proceedings of the civil courts, it is not thought proper to vest them with power to try these suits, which will only be disposed of by the Collector or his Deputy. A summary procedure will be followed, and no appeals will be allowed. Yet there is one hope, the effect of such decision by the Collector will not extend beyond ten years. Like the ten years' settlement once made between Government and the zemindars, the Collectors will proceed from one district to another making, after a three and a half days' deliberation, ten years' settlements between the zemindars and their tenants. We object on behalf of the ryots that one ten years' settlement has ruined them, and they will have nothing to do with decennial settlements any more. We suppose them urging the following objections :—"We do not want such a dreadful law. If we ever, by rising against the zemindars, be found to disturb the public peace, you have your invincible Police Magistrates, with their thunders, spacious walled prisons, your oil machines, representing the progress of the civilization of the nineteenth century, and can throw us in large numbers, after summary trials, into prison, and make us work at the oil-mill. Such a course will add to the revenues of the State, secure the good government of the country, the prosperity of the zemindars, and the ruin of ourselves. If this does not complete our ruin, you may know we are invincible, and proof against decay and death. We have suffered famines, droughts, and pestilences; we have witnessed the Moghuls, the Pathans, the Burgies, and the Dacoits; we have known indigo planters, mahajuns, naib gomastahs, paiks, and the police, and now have before our eyes pleaders and mooktears. We have endured, and do still endure, all. We have now been convinced at last that we shall not die, but shall continue to look on from our prostrate condition. And Lord! Why are we thus afflicted? Our ruler has not hesitated to say that 'the ryots might begin to combine in refusing to pay the rent.' But we will promise on our oath that we shall never refuse to pay what will be justly due to the landlords. Ministering to the comfort of a guest, defending the honor of the female sex, and paying the revenue due to the sovereign, are the great duties of our lives. Our children repeat on the play-ground—'Give the king his due.' We shall never defraud our sovereign of what is due to him. If it then be asked what is the cause of so many suits for arrears of rent? We answer: *first*, we are not able to pay the instalments monthly; *secondly*, even when able, we do not voluntarily pay them, for we have no faith in the zemindar's accounts. We have never sought to defraud the landlord of what is due to him. Do not place us under the Collectors for the decision of rent rates." Such are the laments of the ryots and ourselves. The objections of the lawyer follow. Owing to the spread of civilization, the state of things has quite changed of late years. The ryots are no longer what they were, the passive objects of the oppression of zemindars. They have now learnt their rights. So that it is next to impossible that they can be now easily made to agree to any unjust proposals of their landlords. As far as we know of the nature of the zemindars, we can say that they would not even hesitate to coin the life-blood of the ryots into money, if such a thing were possible. Under these circumstances, the occasional breaking out of agrarian disturbances is highly probable. But it is extremely difficult to legislate on the subject without having sufficient data, which alone can warrant such a proceeding. The disputes between landlords and tenants have been hitherto decided according to Acts X of 1859 and VIII of 1869. It would be well if, instead of a law,



as contemplated by the proposed bill, providing for unforeseen and uncertain occurrences, the defects and imperfections of these two existing Acts were amended and removed. Moreover, the present bill will hardly succeed in attaining the object for which it is framed when apprehended dangers actually break out. Some regard Act X of 1859 as a bulwark of the liberty of the helpless ryots. Even section 6 of Act VIII of 1869, referring to the right of occupancy of a ryot of twelve years' standing, which was much admired by the late Justice Dwárkánáth Mittra, would be nowhere, if the present bill were passed into law. And surely that would be no common evil. It is sought in the bill to put an end to rent disputes by a summary process; but the haste will, we fear, interfere with the justice of the decisions, as is generally the case in all summary trials, especially such as are conducted under section 18 of the Criminal Procedure Code and in the Small Cause Courts. We do not know the law that regulates summary trials. A suit of the value of Rs. 500 is decided in half an hour in a Small Cause Court, and no appeal lies against the decision. A Joint-Magistrate can, after listening only to a few words of two witnesses, sentence one to jail; and the accused has no power to appeal. But three days and three nights may be spent in hearing a suit valued at Re. 1 for arrears of rent, and an appeal also is allowed. Doubtless the gods and the spirits of our ancestors in heaven heartily laugh at the mockery of justice administered according to the law in our law-courts. God only knows what fearful consequences will follow from the introduction of the system of summary procedure in the rent suits. The moonsiffs should, by every means, be empowered to try these suits, instead of the Collectors, who lack experience and proficiency in the law relating to property, and the difficult questions that are frequently raised in connection with rights. We do not see the good sought to be effected by section 10 of the bill. It is ambiguous. The bill will be positively injurious. The system of summary trials will only benefit the rich zemindar, and not the poor ryot. We hope Sir Richard Temple, out of regard to public opinion, will not make an effort to pass this Bill.

SAHDARANI,  
May 9th, 1875.

8. The same paper in another article on the zemindar, observes as follows:—The present system of realizing rents from the tenantry is extremely deplorable. We have frequently adverted to the misery of the zemindars caused in this way. We only wonder at the indifference of Government. Act X needs prompt revision. We would recommend the following amendments:—

- (1). The Collector should try suits for arrears of rent. The period of limitation should not exceed a month.
- (2). As provided in Act VIII of 1819, zemindars should file a list of arrears in the Collector's court and ask that the rent or the crops should be attached.
- (3). The Collector should cause a warrant of attachment to be served after fifteen days; and should be held responsible for the due service of the warrant and the burden of proof should lie on them.
- (4). The ryots should deposit the amount claimed within the said 15 days with an application. The zemindars should be permitted to draw the money before the hearing of the objections.



( 7 )

- (5). If excessive claims be made, the zemindar shall not obtain any other compensation save the costs, for that would be unjust.
- (6). When the ryots voluntarily, and having ability to do it, refuse to pay the rent, they should be liable to the payment of interest for neglecting to pay the instalment in due time, but not to any other compensation.
- (7). Decrees in suits for arrears of rent, having reference to land, the period of limitation should be twelve years.
- (8). The person who himself cultivates a holding will alone be entitled to the rights thereto appertaining. The transfer of the holding by sale will not entitle the purchaser to the aforesaid rights, if the purchaser do not himself cultivate it.
- (9). The right of holding will extend to so much of a piece of land as is cultivated by the owner himself.
- (10). Neither sale nor purchase to be valid without the sanction of the zemindar.
- (11). A holding not to be sold or put up to auction for any other debt. These are the chief points; the rest should be allowed to remain as they are.

9. The *Sahachar* of the 3rd May, in an article on the bill for the prevention of Agrarian Disturbances, remarks with regret, that it will hardly succeed in gaining the object for which it has been framed. It is proposed to empower the Collectors and their deputies to decide suits for enhancement of rent; but though, on the ground of their possessing local experience, revenue officers have been preferred to moonsiffs, still the summary procedure laid down, and according to which the former are to act, will be productive of many evil consequences. The ryots will never petition Government on this matter; for the Government is thus seeking to establish a small cause revenue court. All the advantages will be on the side of the zemindars. If the tenth section be passed, the peasantry will be ruined; for cases for the reduction of rent are very rare. Hardly a hundred such cases are ever instituted in all Bengal. The zemindars will of course institute the suits. It is a fact, and Sir Richard also has himself acknowledged it in his minute, that the great object of the zemindars is to procure the extinction of the rights of permanent ryots, of those who possess the right of occupancy. If the bill be passed, this object will doubtless be accomplished.

SAHACHAR,  
May 3rd, 1875.

The summary procedure adopted, the intricacies in all disputes regarding rent and land, and the advantage afforded to the zemindars of implicating the ryots of several villages in order to ascertain the rental in a certain village, and the wealth of the zemindars, coupled with the consideration that no appeals will be allowed against the decision of the Collector, all militate against the supposition that the Bill will do any good to the tenantry. The Bill has been apparently got up in haste. The sections have not been properly arranged. The ryots have now learnt their rights, and are not willing to part with their hard-earned gains to men, who have not in the least contributed to the improvement of the soil they cultivate.

10. The same paper defends the action of the Government of India in respect to Mulharrao, on the ground that the paramount interests of his

SAHACHAR.



oppressed subjects required such a measure. There can be no doubt that under the new *regimé* the people of Baroda will enjoy the blessings of a civilized Government.

SAHACHAR,  
May 10th, 1875.

11. The *Sahachar* of the 10th May observes, in reference to the recent disturbances at Baroda, consequent on the deposition of Mulharrao, that Government should bring him down to Calcutta; for conspiracies will be unavoidable if he be allowed to reside at Madras, Vellore, or Tanjore. The sooner the agitation about Mulharrao ceases, the better it will be for the public.

SAHACHAR.

12. The same paper writes the following on the Bill for the prevention of Agrarian Disturbances:—"Summary procedure" has become the order of the day. In the criminal courts, the courts of small causes, even in those of moonsifs, to a certain extent, this summary trial has been introduced. The Civil Appeals' Bill is about to be passed, and now the Government of Bengal has framed a Rent Bill. These are hard times, and Government are opposed to tardy and showy processes. Under the plea that the machinery of the present laws is extremely intricate and cumbrous, a summary procedure is being introduced into all departments of the administration of justice, in apparent forgetfulness of the fact that the ends of justice are frequently frustrated by this method.

The present Rent Bill also is not free from this characteristic. The sections have all been laid down in this manner. While the Lieutenant-Governor himself is in Darjeeling, the Bill has been presented to a select committee, with orders to report within a month. There is not a single individual in the Legislative Council to speak a word in favor of the ryots. Let Government act with caution, for they are about to ruin the country by this measure. What are the people and their associations doing now? This is the time for their actions. We venture to observe that if the present Bill be passed, the ryots will be placed, bound hand and foot, completely at the mercy of the zemindars. Though in the long run the latter will doubtless be the losers, still the danger to the tenantry is at present extreme. The zemindars should by no means be permitted to enhance the rent-rate, for they have not in the least contributed to the improvement of the land. They would doubtless have been justly entitled to a share in its increased profit, if they had done anything to bring about this improvement. But the zemindars of Bengal are signally wanting in their duties. In conclusion, Government is requested not to be hasty in passing this bill. They have heard what the zemindars had to say. Does it not behove them also to hear the other side of the question from the people? The zemindars of Calcutta, far from representing the country, do not even adequately represent their own class. Let a full enquiry be made, and then the truth will be known.

RAJSHAHY  
SAMACHAR,  
May 5th, 1874.

13. The *Rájsháhye Samáchár* of the 5th May remarks that Government, if it has really any intention of appointing competent natives to the covenanted civil service without their going to England, should hold such examinations here for testing the competency of the candidates as will be equally difficult as those held in England for the same purpose. Such a course would be greatly preferable to the one that has been proposed, viz. of appointing only those who have displayed proficiency in the public service.

HINDU RANJIKÁ,  
May 5th, 1874.

14. The *Hindu Ranjiká* of the 5th May is gratified to find that Government, instead of annexing Baroda to the British Empire, which was feared at one time, has restored a native administration to that kingdom. This



( 9 )

measure has shown the wisdom and justice of the British Government. As for Mulharrao, the interests of his oppressed subjects and his own unfitness to rule, and the proof of his guilt as disclosed by his trial, are all considerations that justify his deposition. The appointment of the Commission was a wise measure, and has clearly shown that, unless convicted of a serious crime, Government is not disposed to deal severely with anybody. The trial will also be a lesson to other native princes, who may happen to be guilty of allowing misrule to prevail in their states.

15. The *Amrita Bazar Patriká* of the 6th May, complains that the report of the Commission, appointed by Government to inquire into the murder alleged to have been committed by Stephens, a tea-planter of Assam, has not yet been given to the public. The subject matter of inquiry is one of extreme importance. It has a close connection with the question of the almost unlimited power, enjoyed by the police in this country, and the oppressions practised with impunity by the planters in the mofussil. The seeming unwillingness of Government to publish the report of the Commission is likely to give rise to extremely unpleasant surmises. Natives have not been satisfied with the result of even one, of the many Commissions appointed, since Lord Northbrook came to this country. The Baroda Commission, the one for trying Surendra Nath, that for the Judge of Rungpore, and lastly this about Stephens, have all been unsatisfactory in their results.

AMRITA BAZAR  
PATRIKA,  
May 6th, 1875.

16. Adverting to the expected visit of the Prince of Wales to India, the same paper observes that the country is too poor to meet the expenses of the visit of that august personage, and advises the people, such an event occurring, to represent their woes and grievances to His Royal Highness.

17. The *Education Gazette* of the 7th May observes, in reference to the Bill for the prevention of Agrarian Disturbances, that there are several minor defects in the bill, which, it is hoped, will be removed by the select committee. In short, so long as the laws relating to the realization of Government revenue, and especially the sunset-law, continue in force, Government is bound to provide the zemindars with facilities for realizing with ease, what is due to them from their tenantry, and for enhancing the rent. For how can the zemindar be expected to pay the revenue if he is not able to realize his rents? Where the ryots form combinations, it is hard for the zemindar to institute suits for rent against each of them. Hence the interposition of the Government is necessary.

EDUCATION GAZETTE,  
May 7th, 1875.

18. The *Bhārat Sangskarak* of the 7th May, in an editorial on the rent bill of the Bengal Council, now before the Select Committee, observes that from a study of the minute penned by His Honor on this subject, it appears that he advocates the transfer of the disposal of the rent-suits from the hands of the Moonsifs to the Collectors. Such a proposal, if carried out, will be productive of injurious consequences. The ends of justice will not be attained by adopting the summary procedure proposed to be followed in the decision of these difficult and important suits. Moreover, the multifarious nature of the duties entrusted to the Collectors will leave them but little leisure duly to attend to this new duty. We would have no objection to the bill if it were only a provisional measure, designed to put a stop to a temporary grievance. But as it affects matters of a permanent nature, greater care and consideration are required to make it worthy of the great objects it is intended to secure.

BHARAT  
SANGSKARAK,  
May 7th, 1875.

19. The *Hindu Hitoishini* of the 8th May directs the attention of Government to the unsatisfactory state of the normal schools. A large amount

HINDU HITOISHINI,  
May 8th, 1875.



of public funds is expended on them, while no attention is paid to secure a proper selection of text-books and regularity of training. The time for holding examinations also is left uncertain.

DACCA PRAKASH,  
May 9th, 1875.

20. The *Dacca Prakash* of the 9th May regrets that even the issue of the Guicowar are precluded from ascending the throne of Baroda. They are not guilty of any crime. It is extremely desirable that Government should review its resolution relating to the descendants of Mulharrao being debarred from attaining to any honors appertaining to the Baroda guddee.

BENGALI TRANSLATOR'S OFFICE,

The 15th May 1875.

JOHN ROBINSON,

Government Bengali Translator.

*List of Native Newspapers received and examined for the Week ending the  
15th May 1875.*

No.	Name.	Place of publication.	Monthly, weekly, or otherwise.	Date.
1	"Madhyastha" ...	Calcutta ...	Monthly ...	Chaitra, 1281 B.S.
2	"Uchit Baktá" ...	Azimgunge, Moorsheadabad ...	Bi-monthly ...	9th May.
3	"Rungpore Dik Prakash" ...	Kákinia, Rungpore ...	Weekly ...	22nd and 29th April.
4	"Sádháraní" ...	Chinsurah ...	Ditto ...	2nd and 9th May.
5	"Sahachar" ...	Calcutta ...	Ditto ...	3rd and 10th May.
6	"Hitasádhini" ...	Burrisal ...	Ditto ...	4th May.
7	"Burrisal Bártábaha" ...	Ditto ...	Ditto ...	5th ditto.
8	"Rájsháhye Samáchar" ...	Karachmáris, Rájsháhye ...	Ditto ...	5th ditto.
9	"Hindu Ranjiká" ...	Bauleah, Rájsháhye ...	Ditto ...	5th ditto.
10	"Amrita Bazar Patriká" ...	Calcutta ...	Ditto ...	6th ditto.
11	"Education Gazette" ...	Hooghly ...	Ditto ...	7th ditto.
12	"Bhárat Sangakarak" ...	Harinávi, 24-Pergunnahs ...	Ditto ...	7th ditto.
13	"Pracháriká" ...	Burdwan ...	Ditto ...	7th ditto.
14	"Hindu Hitoishini" ...	Dacca ...	Ditto ...	8th ditto.
15	"Dacca Prakash" ...	Ditto ...	Ditto ...	9th ditto.
16	"Sulabha Samáchar" ...	Calcutta ...	Ditto ...	11th ditto.
17	"Sáptáshik Sambád" ...	Bhowanipore, Calcutta ...	Ditto ...	14th ditto.
18	"Banga Vidyá Prakashiká" ...	Calcutta ...	Daily ...	10th to 13th May.
19	"Sambád Prabhákar" ...	Ditto ...	Ditto ...	5th to 11th ditto.
20	"Sambád Párnachandro- daya." ...	Ditto ...	Ditto ...	7th to 13th ditto.
21	"Prabhát Samir" ...	Ditto ...	Ditto ...	8th to 12th ditto.
22	"Urdu Guide" (in Urdu) ...	Ditto ...	Weekly ...	8th May.

Bengal Secretariat Press.